



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,752	11/18/2003	Andrea Branca	CM2543CQ	5522

27752 7590 03/02/2006

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161  
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER
----------

MAZUMDAR, SONYA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1734

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/715,752	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BRANCA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Sonya Mazumdar	<b>Art Unit</b> 1734	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 10-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 8, 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/18/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. In response to applicant's amendment, see page 9, filed January 30, 2006, with respect to the objection of the drawings, the objection has been withdrawn.

In response to applicant's amendment, see pages 3, 4, and 22, filed January 30, 2006, with respect to the objection of the specification, the objection has been withdrawn.

In response to applicant's amendment, see page 11, filed January 30, 2006, with respect to the objection of claim 2, the objection has been withdrawn.

In response to applicant's amendments and arguments, see pages 11 and 12, filed January 30, 2006, with respect to claims 1, 6, 8 and 14, the rejection of those claims under 35 USC 112 has been withdrawn.

In response to applicant's amendments, see page 10, filed January 30, 2006, indicated claims 15 through 21 are both pending and cancelled. The listing of claims indicates these claims are withdrawn. Thus the claims have been treated as withdrawn, not cancelled.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 through 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1734

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 2, 3, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al. in view of Hefele (US 4141313) and Buell (US 4147580).

With respect to claim 1, Yajima et al. teaches the patterned dot deposition of a liquid adhesive onto the outer surface of an article by means of a stamp roller provided with a pattern of depression pits where the adhesive is deposited. The surface of the first roller is contacted with a blade tangential to the surface of the roller and lies with its end firmly against the surface of the roller. The adhesive is drawn off the stamp roller and is directly applied through contact with the surface of a cloth on a pressure take-off roller. (abstract; column 1, lines 7-13 and line 19; column 2, lines 35-38; Figures 1 and 3)

The difference between Yajima et al. and claim 1 are the multitude of applicators and the angle of the scraper blade. Hefele teaches a method using two adhesive suppliers placed around the engraved roller. Also, the surface of the first roller is contacted with a blade with an angle of 40 degrees with the tangent of the surface of the

Art Unit: 1734

roller and lies with its end firmly against its' surface (column 5, lines 37-40, 51-52; column 9, lines 35-38).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a multitude of applicators as well as a blade with a specified angle from the surface. One would have been motivated to do so because a multitude of applicators would provide a fuller adhesive pattern coating on the surface and the amount of adhesive shown in the pattern is dependent on the angle of the blade.

Also, Yajima et al. in view of Hefele does not teach heating the adhesive applicators placed around the engraved roller to a specified temperature. Buell teaches applying a hot-melt adhesive at a temperature from 280°F (137°C) to about 320°F (160°C). (column 5, lines 1-23)

It would have been obvious for Hefele to heat the adhesive applicators to an application temperature Buell had taught because one would have been motivated to have an adhesive of appropriate temperature, flow, and adhesive characteristics for coating a porous, fibrous web.

With respect to claim 2, Yajima et al. teaches the patterned dot deposition of a liquid adhesive onto the outer surface of an article by means of a stamp roller provided with a pattern of depression pits where the adhesive is deposited. The surface of the first roller is contacted with a blade tangential to the surface of the roller and lies with its end firmly against the surface of the roller. The adhesive is drawn off the stamp roller and is directly applied through contact with the surface of a cloth on a pressure take-off

Art Unit: 1734

roller. (abstract; column 1, lines 7-13 and line 19; column 2, lines 35-38; Figures 1 and 3)

The difference between Yajima et al. and claim 1 are the multitude of applicators. Hefele teaches a method using two adhesive suppliers placed around the engraved roller. (column 9, lines 35-38).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a multitude of applicators. One would have been motivated to do so because a multitude of applicators would provide a fuller adhesive pattern coating on the surface.

Also, Yajima et al. in view of Hefele does not teach heating the adhesive applicators placed around the engraved roller to a specified temperature. Buell teaches applying a hot-melt adhesive at a temperature from 280°F (137°C) to about 320°F (160 °C). (column 5, lines 1-23)

It would have been obvious for Hefele to heat the adhesive applicators to an application temperature Buell had taught because one would have been motivated to have an adhesive of appropriate temperature, flow, and adhesive characteristics for coating a porous, fibrous web.

With respect to claim 3, Yajima et al. teaches the use of a patterned stamp roller rotating in a counter-clockwise direction (Figure 1), but does not teach rotating the pressure take-off roller. However, it would have been obvious for Yajima et al. to rotate the pressure take-off roller in a clockwise direction for the cloth to be carried continuously along with the rotation of the patterned stamp roller, pinched between the

peripheral surfaces of the pressure take-off roller and the stamp roller and making its exit after going through the rollers. (column 1, lines 49-55; column 3, lines 18-26)

With respect to claim 11, Yajima et al. teaches the use of the engraved roller having depressions where the adhesive is inserted (column 1, lines 40-44; Figure 1).

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al. in view of Hefele and Buell as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Lender et al. (EP 0978263) and Friesch (US 5064492).

Even though Buell teaches applying a coating at a heated temperature, the difference between Yajima et al. in view of Hefele and Buell and claim 4 is the method of heating the coater and the engraved roller and cooling the pressure take-off roller. Lender et al. teaches to keep the coater and engraving roller at a high temperature (Lender et al. - column 18; lines 25-41) and Friesch teaches the cooling of the adhesive after imprinting on the substrate (Friesch - column 3, lines 52-59).

It would have been obvious to for Yajima et al. in view of Hefele and Buell to heat the coater and engraving roller and cool the pressure take-off roller. One would have been motivated to do so because the adhesive should be at a solid or semi-solid plastic state at temperatures at or below the usage temperature of the disposable absorbent product (Lender et al. – column 4, lines 52-56).

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al. in view of Hefele (US 4141313) and Buell (US 4147580) as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Hefele (US 5569348).

Art Unit: 1734

The difference between the combined teachings of Yajima et al., Hefele, and Buell and the claim is the operation of a pressure take-off roller above 30 degrees Celsius. Hefele (US 5569348) teaches cooling the carrier band coated with adhesive to room temperature, approximately 25 degrees Celsius, over a curved cooled surface. (column 7, lines 43-46)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate the pressure take-off roller at room temperature. One would have been motivated to do so because it would not require further energy or expense to maintain the roller at room temperature.

6. Claims 10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al. in view of Hefele (US 4141313) and Buell as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Kaylor et al. (US 2003/0138570)

The teachings for claim 3 are as described above.

The difference between the combined teachings of Yajima et al., Hefele, and Buell and claim 10 is the use of a take-off roller with a specified shore A hardness value. Kaylor et al. teaches an impression roller supporting the substrate having a preferable Shore A hardness of 70 (paragraph 0051, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a roller having a Shore A hardness of 70 in Hefele based on the teachings of Kaylor et al. One would have been motivated to do so because Kaylor et al. teaches such a roller is known and used in applying active material to a substrate, thus can be used by one of ordinary skill in the art.



The difference between the combined teachings of Yajima et al., Hefelee, and Buell and claim 12 is the use of the engraved roller with specified width and depth of the cavities. Kaylor et al. teaches the width of the produced pattern ranging from about 0.1 microns to about 70 microns across (paragraph 0015). The depth of the cavities in the engraved roller used in the examples was specified as 51 microns (paragraph 0075).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a roller having the previously specified width and depth of the cavities in based on the teachings of Kaylor et al. One would have been motivated to do so because Kaylor et al. teaches such specifications of the roller as known and used in applying active material to a substrate, thus can be used by one of ordinary skill in the art. "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." (MPEP § 2144.05)

The difference between the combined teachings of Yajima et al., Hefelee, and Buell and claim 13 is rotating the article around the pressure take-off roller, which exits at a specified angle. Kaylor et al. teaches the contact angle of the active material with respect to the substrate is from about 30 to 70 degrees (paragraph 0016). It can be seen from Figure 1 that the contact angle and its' complementary angle, the exit angle of the formed web, are relatively congruent to each other.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rotate the substrate around the pressure take-off roller, contact the substrate with the adhesive, and have the web exit at a specified angle in Yajima et

Art Unit: 1734

al., Hefe, and Buell based on the teachings of Kaylor et al. One would have been motivated to do so because Kaylore et al. teaches such a method as known and used in applying a certain amount of active material to a substrate, thus can be used by one of ordinary skill in the art. "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." (MPEP § 2144.05)

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al. in view of Hefe (US 4141313), Buell, and Hefe (US 5569348) as applied to claim 7, and further in view of Datta et al. (US 5695376)

The teachings of claim 7 are as described above.

The difference between the combined teachings of Yajima et al., Hefe (US 4141313), Buell, and Hefe (US 5569348) and claim 14 is using articles with a melting temperature of the articles lower than the engraving roller. Datta et al. teaches forming personal care articles where the bonding process should keep the adhesive component melted, but below the melting point of the structural component. (column 7, lines 56-60; column 10, lines 10-14)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use articles with a melting temperature lower than the engraving roller. One would have been motivated to do so since the roller will effectively soften the web and then allow the adhesive to adhere thereto more effectively only if the heated roller is kept at a temperature higher than the article temperature.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 5, 6, 8, and 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

References showed coaters or applicators to have a higher temperature than the engraving roller, or made no mention of the temperatures used. In HefeLe, the adhesive is desired to be above its melting point and the engraving roller is maintained at 35 degrees Celsius (column 8, lines 10-32). In Lender et al. the adhesive has an application temperature higher than that of the printing roll. (column 4, lines 34-40).

References show a coater comprising a multitude of extruder applicators providing a multitude of extruded beads of active material, but do not mention having a pitch of a certain length. In HefeLe, the coaters extrude the material into the depressions of the engraved roller to form sealed beads (column 1, lines 23-24 and lines 29-43; Figure 1)

Claims 8 and 9 are dependant on claim 6.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1734


extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sonya Mazumdar whose telephone number is (571) 272-6019. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Fiorilla can be reached on (571) 272-1187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
SM

  
CHRIS FIORILLA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
Au 1734